1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
3	PORTLAND DIVISION
4	INTER CHARGO OF AMERICA
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,))
6	Plaintiff,) Case No. 3:14-cr-00267-BR)
7	v.)) December 21, 2015
8	MORGAN ELIZABETH GODVIN,)
9	Defendant.) Portland, Oregon
10	
11	
12	
13	SENTENCING
14	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANNA J. BROWN
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 APPEARANCES 2 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: LEAH K. BOLSTAD United States Attorney's Office 3 1000 SW Third Street Suite 600 4 Portland, OR 97204 5 FOR THE DEFENDANT: RUSSELL S. BARNETT III 6 Russell S. Barnett III PC 1500 SW 1st Avenue 7 Suite 780 Portland, OR 97201 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 COURT REPORTER: Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR United States District Courthouse 22 1000 SW Third Avenue, Room 301 Portland, OR 97204 23 (503)326-8191 24 25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. Please be seated. Ms. Bolstad?

MS. BOLSTAD: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon.

Leah Bolstad for the United States. This is the matter of the

United States v. Morgan Elizabeth Godvin. Case number

14-cr-267. This is the sixth defendant listed in that case.

Ms. Godvin is present. She is in custody, represented by

counsel, Mr. Barnett. We're here for Ms. Godvin's sentencing.

I've submitted a sentencing memorandum as well as a letter that is dated -- I think I actually sent you two separate letters. One is dated December 16, 2015, and the other is dated December 17th. The letter of the 17th is -- have enclosed a video that's approximately 20 minutes with excerpts of what Ms. Godvin put together.

THE COURT: Yes. I have had a chance to review that video. Would you state, please, the government's sentencing position?

MS. BOLSTAD: Your Honor, in this case, you will -you well remember trial in this matter. Early November of
2015. Ms. Godvin didn't go to trial. She was a cooperating
co-defendant, and she testified in the trial of two other much
higher-ranking heroin traffickers in this conspiracy case. I
thought her testimony was brave, straightforward. She did not
hold back in a way that made herself look good. She just did

what was asked of her. She told the truth. Sometimes that truth made her look really bad. She owned up to doing some -- making some very bad mistakes. And from the very beginning of this case, until today's sentencing, Ms. Godvin has been consistent in taking ownership of her actions. Much more so than many other defendants I've seen in her shoes.

I think that Ms. Godvin has come a long way since the beginning of this case, and the government's recommendation at sentencing is one that is grounded in treating the defendants in this case and comparing them to all other defendants in Len Bias cases the same.

Based on that guideline analysis and employing the things that apply, as the PSR states, we started at a base offense level of 38, which is the highest level you can do in a drug case, a two-level enhancement for a dangerous weapon, a three-level reduction for minor role, a three-level reduction for acceptance, and a two-level reduction on the government's motion under 3553(a) for her very early acceptance of responsibility, and a four-level reduction based on my motion under Chapter 5K of the guidelines. And all of those things bring us to an offense level 28, Criminal History Category II, where the range is 87 to 108 months.

This is the exact same guideline analysis that the

Court -- that the government submitted in Mr. Rosa's case. He

was a co-defendant.

2 -

And you will recall that in Mr. Rosa's case the 87 months -- the government moved for a reduction of the 87 down to 71, based, in part, on the fact that Mr. Rosa was not -- we did not believe he would get credit for that time on his federal case because he was not writted to the state of Oregon until much later in the game. After his Ohio case resolved.

So without that Ohio case, Mr. Rosa -- the low end of 87 seemed very appropriate for him.

This defendant reaches the same low end, 87, but I'm asking the government for a downward variance from there.

THE COURT: Asking the Court?

MS. BOLSTAD: I'm sorry. I'm asking the Court for a variance to 60 months' imprisonment. And I think that my word will fall short as to why. I think that Ms. Godvin is very eloquent in speaking for herself. You've seen her videos, the excerpts of what she had to say about how much she's learned from this, her plans for the future, and her own remorse in this matter.

But I think that most important to Ms. Godvin is her plans for the future. This is somebody who's thought a lot about what to do next. She's really contemplative, and I think that when you hear her plans for the future, that's something that will inform your decision about what to sentence her to because I'm not sure that more prison is necessarily the answer for Ms. Godvin. I think that with a lot of structure on supervised

release she could be very successful.

It will be up to Ms. Godvin. But I think that with random UAs, a structured life where she's reporting to people constantly, is going to be very good for her. And unlike a lot of other defendants who we see, I think that Ms. Godvin has the intellect and the capacity to make very good choices. As you'll see here in court, she's surrounded by a very supportive community that she has told us that she's reconnected with since her time in custody. And it's sad and I know she's ashamed that it took being in jail to reconnect with these people who support and love her, but that's where we are. And I think with their continued support she will make better choices in the future.

I know that the victim's mother, Ms. Gren -- is Ms. Gren here? Not yet. Ms. Gren does intend -- I know she's on her way to be here for sentencing, and she did wish to say something, and I know that Ms. Godvin wished to speak to Ms. Gren when she addresses the Court in this case.

But 60 months is what I'm authorized to ask for. It's a downward variance. And I think the Court will -- you'll be well informed after you hear Ms. Godvin.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Bolstad.
Mr. Barnett, good afternoon.

MR. BARNETT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Russell Barnett on behalf of Ms. Godvin. Your Honor, I'm

loathed to ever use superlatives, but in this case, actually, I think it's appropriate. I have never represented a client in my 20 years of doing this that has put so much effort and thought into what she's going to do after incarceration.

Honestly, never.

Candidly, she's put as much effort into her future as I have. As Ms. Bolstad will tell you I've put a lot of effort into this case. Ms. Godvin has, I believe, a great chance of success. I have made an offer to her that I think I've only made three or four times in the past 20 years that I would be happy to be a resource for her in any way whatsoever when she gets out.

There's really not enough time in the day for me to go through all of the things that Ms. Godvin has accomplished while she's been in custody that will set her apart, but I would like to run down a few.

As Ms. Bolstad stated, her acceptance of responsibility and the candor with which she accepted responsibility -- literally, on the day of her initial appearance was her first debrief. There was -- even at that initial meeting there was no minimalization, no sugarcoating, no dancing around it. It was refreshingly frank.

As you're aware, she worked with the United States

Attorney's Office to produce a video. Hopefully that can be used for education not only of high school students, younger

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

folks, to try to explain some of the concerns and worries for the use of heroin and the risks attendant thereof, but also that Ms. Bolstad is feeling it may be something she may be able to use for education of other United States attorneys as well as law enforcement agents.

During the time she's been in the Columbia County Jail, she enrolled in college. I've never had a client pre-prison arrange for and enroll in college, and I would love to be able to stand here and tell you she got an A in her coursework, but I can't. The reason being is when she was transferred -- step back.

Mind you, the Columbia County Jail folks were happy to proctor exams for her and everything. When she was transferred to Multnomah County for testimony during trial, she brought all of her belongings with her, including her -- \$200?

THE DEFENDANT: \$219.

MR. BARNETT: -- \$219 textbook. Multnomah County Sheriff's Office threw it away. She wasn't able to get a replacement in time to finish up by the conclusion of the term, but she put the effort in there.

She also -- excuse me. She's going to stay in my memory for a long time for the story I'm about to relay. We had a phone conference while she was at MCI, at Inverness, and she told me that she kept her pizza. And I didn't quite know what that meant, and then she explained it to me.

In commissary she could buy pizza while she was in custody. She had pizza and heated it up and was approached by another inmate who offered her drugs in exchange for a slice of pizza. And Ms. Godvin said --

THE DEFENDANT: "No thanks. I'm good."

MR. BARNETT: And kept her pizza.

Truly, it's one of the most moving things I've ever heard. Given her history and difficulty of saying no in challenging circumstances, and she did that, it just -- it floored me, to use the vernacular.

While she was in custody at MCIJ, the Court will recall from an earlier court hearing, we had asked for assistance from the Court to get her transferred out of IJ because of the rampant availability of drugs for in-custody inmates. We appreciate the -- the help, well, from Ms. Bolstad and the Court that got her into Columbia County.

As she was transferred out, I contacted the intelligence officer for Multnomah County Sheriff's to let them know that Ms. Godvin would be happy to provide information about how drugs were coming in. He referred me to a detective. A detective contacted me. I said that she had been transferred to Columbia County. He said that any information she has is stale and hung up the phone.

It's ironic my client was more concerned about solving a problem of drugs in the jail than the jailer.

Just as an aside, since she's been in Columbia County -another first -- she tells me that one of the deputies, one of
the corrections deputies is actually here in support. I've
never had that in a case before. While she's been in custody,
her student loans are current. She has developed a plan of
action for reduction or the elimination of drugs in custody. I
think some of that was contained in the documents I provided to
the Court. It was a well-thought-through plan. It seems
remarkably obvious, and I'm surprised that it's not current
practice.

Ms. Bolstad and I have both discussed perhaps meeting with the sheriff after this case and presenting Morgan's plan to him and note the serious problem that it does have with regard to drugs in the jail.

There's another program that I will be writing up as a formal proposal. And at first I was thinking on a -- step back. Morgan came up with a great idea. What if inmates, before they were released, were trained in the use of Narcan? Narcan is the narcotic antagonist that if given immediately it reverses the effects of an opiate. There is Narcan training. It's not that difficult in the number of lives it can save. She had the insight to point out that that almost self-selects the population that will have the most contact with people at risk for overdose.

I've told her that I will be writing, with her help, even

after she's moved out of here, going to write that as a formal proposal. I was thinking about submitting it to some local sheriff's offices, and we'll do that, but it's also one that, as we were visiting yesterday, that checked with a couple of my acquaintances in the Oregon House of Representatives, and that might make for an interesting bill in the next full session.

It's just such a brilliantly elegant idea and solution to a problem that's just, again, one of a kind.

She's been in contact with both her -- Senator Merkley, as well as Representative Bonamici. She's been in contact with them for purposes of planning for her future. She is checking in with Senator Merkley for the availability of educational funding after her release, even though she will have a federal conviction. She's also been in contact with Representative Bonamici. I forwarded a copy of that letter today to the Court. Ms. Bolstad has reviewed that as well.

She has done a phenomenal job of maintaining and developing a good social support network, as you can see. She, in addition, has picked up me as a supporter, and I've told her if she uses when she gets out she will never hear the end of it from me. I will be thoroughly disappointed. She's given me her word, and I'll take it at that.

I'm imploring the Court to go along with the government's recommendation of 60 months. The PSR writer also suggests 60 months.

I'm about to have to do the hardest thing to do as a lawyer, as a defense lawyer, and I'm about to stop talking.

And I know there are going to be hundreds of things I'm going to wish I would have said that I could have brought to your attention about Ms. Godvin, but thank you.

We'll speak a little more with regard to her release plan.

But one of the conditions she's going to ask the Court to impose as her probation is that she be mandated to take Vivitrol.

Vivitrol is a very effective drug that, thanks to Morgan,

I've learned a lot about. It basically prevents the person

from feeling the effects or the enjoyment, if you will, of

heroin or other opiates. She's indicated to me that she

believes that will be a very helpful agent to help her maintain

her sobriety and staying clean when she gets out.

Again, that's a first for me, but we would ask the Court to consider that as making that a part of her conditions of release.

That's it.

THE COURT: Before I speak with Ms. Godvin,

Mr. Barnett and Ms. Bolstad, this case has had many references

to the open secret of drug use in the county jail facilities,

and I think it's important that there be a communication to the

sheriff about the issue with reference to specific

documentation.

I would be happy to receive the letter from the two of you to forward it to the sheriff personally with my concern. I don't want to speak out of turn, and I'm certainly not as familiar as the two of you are with respect to the specifics Ms. Godvin has offered.

I think, relating to the sheriff, the fact that one of his investigators did not see fit to follow up may be because that detective has a very heavy caseload or whatever. It is worth mentioning. But the point is there needs to be a referral back to the person ultimately responsible for our jails about the specific information you developed in this case. And that's true as well as to the treatment program where Ms. Godvin testified that she used while in inpatient treatment and how common it was for people to leave the inpatient facility via windows and doors that weren't within range of the motion detector lighting. That needs to be captured and conveyed in a way that I think you can do better than I.

I have already raised the issue with our chief of probation so that the programming issues are being addressed in-house, but I think it's important that a record be made here of the very specific evidence that -- that's come to the public record through Ms. Godvin's testimony and Mr. Barnett's advocacy.

So I encourage you to do that, and then I would be happy to send that letter with my own concerns along with it.

```
MR. BARNETT: Thank you very much.
 1
              THE COURT: So, Ms. Godvin, a couple of formalities
 2
    first.
            I need to be certain you've actually seen the
 3
    presentence report.
 4
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: And actually have reviewed it?
 6
              THE DEFENDANT:
                               I have.
 7
              THE COURT: And discussed it with Mr. Barnett?
 8
                              Yes, I have.
 9
              THE DEFENDANT:
10
              THE COURT: Before I continue with you, let's also
    make a point in this letter about the loss of this book.
11
                               Okay. Yes.
                                            Absolutely.
12
              THE DEFENDANT:
13
              THE COURT: Mr. Barnett, the $219 book. I'm not
    suggesting a point be made, but I think it's important that
14
15
    these issues not just be noted and then ignored. Who knows if
    there aren't many other people this happens to or not, but I
16
    think it should -- it should reach the sheriff's attention.
17
18
              MR. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: All right. So, Ms. Godvin, I have a lot
20
    of material.
21
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: I have the DVD. I have the lawyer's
23
    letter.
             I have your letter. I have Representative Bonamici's
             I have Ms. Bolstad's eloquent advocacy on your behalf.
24
    letter.
25
         What would you like to say?
```

THE DEFENDANT: I think in all these criminal proceedings we -- we lose the human cost of addiction a little bit, and I would like to tell you about Justin DeLong. I met him in 2007, and we became really good friends in 2008. He was super brilliant. We were friends, like, instantly. Because he was so smart, we could have these really deep philosophical conversations. And I'll never forget a joke that he told me in October of 2013. So this is about six months before he died. It was one of the last times we actually hung out.

- "What does heroin smell like, Morgan?"
- "I don't know, Justin. What?"

12 "Vinegar and broken dreams."

And at the time I thought it was funny, you know, like in a sad but true sort of way, because reality of dying from your addiction, that's so abstract when you're in it. Me and Justin, we had conversations, "Oh, yeah, ha ha. This is probably going to kill us." And it killed him. And I -- I'm here today and I'm alive.

In his death, Justin saved me from suffering the exact same fate. I am 100 percent certain I would be dead right now if I had not been arrested.

After my mom died, I was completely and utterly hopeless.

I wanted to kill myself. I had no desire to live. And then

Justin died, and that saved my life, and that's really hard for me to reconcile.

And my experiences at Inverness, it wasn't just that one time, you know. I had many opportunities to use drugs. And I'm just so much better than that. I'm just capable of such greater things.

And I wish my mom could see me now because she would be proud. I actually value my education. That's my number one priority. That's why I pay off my school loans. I make monthly payments on them, even from jail, so that as soon as I get out I can work on getting my bachelor's degree.

And I'm finally being the woman my mother raised me to be and living life to the fullest. Every day that I'm breathing is thanks to Justin DeLong.

THE COURT: Ms. Bolstad, do you have a way of finding out whether Mr. DeLong's mother will make it or not?

Detective Andersen has been in touch with Ms. Gren, who got mixed up parking, and we believe she's approximately five minutes out. She's very upset that she missed --

MS. BOLSTAD: My apologies, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We can adjourn. Why don't we go into recess for about ten minutes.

MS. BOLSTAD: That would be great.

THE COURT: Why don't we go into recess. And when she's here, we'll reconvene.

MR. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. BOLSTAD: Thank you.

```
(Recess taken.)
 1
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you, everyone. Please be seated.
 2
    Ms. Bolstad?
 3
              MS. BOLSTAD: Thank you, Your Honor. We're back on
 4
    the record in the sentencing in the case of United States v.
 5
    Ms. Godvin.
 6
 7
         Thank you for taking a break. The victim's mother is able
    to speak. She's here. Her name is Ms. Gren.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Go ahead and either escort her to where
10
    you're sitting or she can come to the witness chair. Whatever
    is most comfortable.
11
         Good afternoon.
12
13
              MS. GREN: Hi.
              THE COURT: Would you pull the microphone close to
14
15
    you, please?
16
              MS. GREN: Is that better?
17
              THE COURT: Perfect. Would you state your full name
18
    and spell it all just so the record is clear?
19
              MS. GREN: Yes. It's Ember Leanne Gren.
                                                         E-M-B-E-R.
20
    L-E-A-N-N-E. Gren, G-R-E-N.
              THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Gren. What would you like
21
22
    to tell me?
23
              MS. GREN: A lot of things.
         So it's an impact statement, and it impacts me because he
24
25
    was my son. And it's interesting. I heard an author speak
```

once, and she addressed things and used the term "a single story" and having a single story about people or things, and I feel like I really appreciate everything that the legal system does. I feel that it's a single story that gets addressed, though.

My son is a single story in here as the victim. And other people's single stories are people who sold him drugs or -- but there's other stories. There's other stories to Morgan, because I know her, and there's another story to Justin. He wasn't just a victim. He was a -- he dealt heroin to support his habit too, and he was also my son and my daughter's brother.

At some point I hope with drug addiction it's less of a single story. I'm sorry. I'll slow down a little.

With addiction and with the way we treat drug addiction and people who are caught up in it and dealing drugs and using them, I hope it becomes somehow less of a single story, and we address them as full human beings.

And even the gentleman from Mexico, it's a single story that we have about them coming here and dealing drugs. They have families back home, and they have limited options. It's all just really hard to sit in a courtroom and watch their families during their arraignments and hearings and see that they're losing family members just like I did.

So a lot of impact has been that I lost my son and the

idea of maybe having grandchildren with him and those things, but also it's just broadened the way I think about everyone involved and that it isn't just the one role they're playing in this particular trial.

THE COURT: I saw an email message I believe you sent to the victims coordinator indicating that you were not seeking any restitution --

MS. GREN: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- in this prosecution. Is that right?

MS. GREN: Yes.

THE COURT: And you also made statements about wanting to ensure that people like Ms. Godvin had the opportunity to get past her own addiction and to get on with her life. So thank you for sending that message. It's an important one.

These are losses that none of us can imagine until we're in the same situation and many people, certainly in their single story as a victim, can't see beyond that and always harbor a bitterness and a resentfulness that is natural and human, but you've extended to her something that I think no one else could, and I think it's shown, in part, in the way she has fully accepted responsibility and tried to begin to repair her life so that she's not waiting -- she's not wasting time.

She's acting on a commitment.

I believe fully that that was enabled by your attitude

toward her, and I think that is important.

Is there anything else you wanted to say?

MS. GREN: No. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you so much for coming.

Ms. Godvin, you wanted to say something to Ms. Gren?

THE DEFENDANT: I did. I really liked your single story concept. I wrote you this letter here, and I go on for pages. I just tell stories about Justin and I and the good times. Some of them are drug related. Some of them aren't because there was so much more to our friendship than that.

The letter you wrote for the judge on my behalf, it was amazing how accurately you described our relationship because Justin and I did, we loved each other so much. We -- it's hard to find smart heroin addicts. It's really hard. And he was really -- he was a brilliant guy. When we lived in the Rivergreens Apartment complex, there was a golf course there, and he would always try to get me to go golfing. It was not happening. Golf was really boring, so that never happened, but we did other things.

He was the first person I ever knew that went to jail, and I was pretty distraught over that because people I knew didn't do that. So I went -- I went to his arraignment, and I put \$40 on his books. That was all. And he never let me forget it, and he felt like he was in my debt for years to come. It didn't matter if I didn't have money. Anytime I was dope sick,

Justin would help me out for years because of that one time I put \$40 on his books.

In 2012 I relapsed, and he was -- I was living in Bend, and I moved to my mom's. I was staying the night at my mom's, and I relapsed, and he was -- I picked him up, and we had gone to my mom's, and I overdosed.

And this was not the first time I overdosed in front of Justin. You were on the phone with Erin the first time. I was really sorry about that. That was the first time he told me I am much, much heavier that I look, trying to carry me and put me -- he had warrants, and I wasn't waking up. He didn't care. And he called 911, and he stayed with me until the police arrived, and he snuck out the back door. He risked arrest.

That's all we did was just -- we loved each other so much.

That very next day after I overdosed I let him borrow my car.

He curbed it and it got a flat tire. This left him completely stranded, and I had to find a ride to him to change my tire, to rescue him, because he wasn't capable of changing the tire.

And he loved Erin so much. He was so worried about her.

MS. GREN: She's doing super awesome.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm so thankful for that.

MS. GREN: She lives with me.

THE DEFENDANT: Please tell her I say hello.

MS. GREN: She's in school.

THE DEFENDANT: There's life after heroin, but Justin

```
and I couldn't see it. I don't know why. I want you to know
 1
    that I'm sorry. The "what ifs" keep me up at night. What if I
 2
    just wouldn't have answered my phone? What if I would have
 3
             Maybe he would have gotten it from someone else, but
    said no?
 4
 5
    maybe he wouldn't have overdosed. I will never know that.
    so sorry. I'm so sorry.
 6
 7
         I was going to die. After my mom died suddenly, I was
    going to die, and Justin completely saved my life. Completely.
 8
    There's no other way I would be alive right now if it had not
 9
10
    been for your son. I just want to thank you.
         And please -- I know it's so inadequate, but please come
11
    to my college graduation because it wouldn't exist if it wasn't
12
    for your son. Okay.
13
              MS. GREN: I will be there.
14
15
              THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you. And I wrote you
16
    this letter.
17
              MS. GREN: Am I allowed to hug Morgan?
18
              THE DEFENDANT: Can she, Judge?
19
              THE COURT:
                          Is there an issue? Do you need to look
20
    at the letter?
21
              THE DEFENDANT: She asked if she could hug me.
22
              THE COURT: Oh, that's up to the marshal.
23
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              I miss him so much. Thank you so
    much for coming. Thank you so much.
24
25
              THE COURT: Mr. Barnett, is there a requested place
```

for designation?

MR. BARNETT: Your Honor, there is not. Although, she would ask to be kept as close as possible so she could maintain her contacts.

And, again, this is a case of the firsts. I would ask the Court to give Morgan the opportunity to build on what she has right now. There's -- in psychology there is the concept of being prepared for something, being mentally and psychologically prepared. I think that Morgan is well prepared at this moment to benefit from what she has created around her and the support system that she has, and I would ask the Court to perhaps consider something less than 60 months to give her the opportunity to capitalize on the unique circumstance that she is in.

And I ask that not so much to reduce the time of her incarceration, as to give her the opportunity to build on the tools that she has created for herself to stay clean and sober. I think that would be of a greater benefit to the community and society as a whole. I ask you to consider that, please.

THE COURT: Ms. Bolstad, is there anything else you had wanted to add?

MS. BOLSTAD: Your Honor, just to clarify, there is no -- there's no mandatory minimum. There nothing inhibiting the Court's discretion beyond 60.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me back up for

purposes of setting context here. My responsibility is to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish many purposes.

At the heart of the sentencing decision is punishment for criminal conduct, along with a recognition of the person's personal history and characteristics, the good that has been demonstrated here, Ms. Godvin, and your background, as well as the criminal conduct, and then I'm required to take advice from the sentencing guidelines. You know there's a maximum penalty of 40 years in prison. The guideline ranges are adjusted for a variety of factors, which I have to take into account.

I'm allowed to exercise discretion both ways. When the guideline calculations correctly produce a range, I'm allowed to exercise discretion above the range or below the range. And the overriding principle is that a sentence has to be enough to punish, enough to promote respect for the law, enough to deter others who could be deterred if they knew about what happened to you and to the others who were convicted of this crime; enough to deter you, if you weren't already deterred; enough to promote respect for the law.

The law that prohibits distributing heroin is there for public safety, above and beyond anything else. And respect for that law, the theory is, helps protect people. And, yet, we have this raging epidemic of not just addiction, but overdoses and deaths.

And against all that, I'm to also balance, as I say, your personal history and characteristics and somehow determine the right thing to do here. A sentence what's enough but not too much.

So with respect to the guidelines, Ms. Bolstad made the point that your crime starts you on the guideline range at the highest level available, which is 38. There were two levels added to that because of the weapon, so we're at level 40. You were considered to be one in a minor role in the conspiracy here, and I agree that that is a fair characterization under the guidelines. So that allows for a three-level reduction. So from 40, we move to 37, and then another three levels for acceptance of responsibility. Two levels is pretty much automatic. When someone pleads guilty, three levels is given. Not in every case. The two plus one to three is not given in every case, but in your case the prosecutor unequivocally recommends it, and I agree because you have fully accepted responsibility.

So we go, then, from 37 to 34.

The prosecutor then recommends two more levels off because you accepted responsibility early. And, as to you, there wasn't any question, from her perspective, that you were not going to cost the prosecution the burden of proving you guilty beyond a reasonable doubt by trial by jury or cost the system the need to pull all the witnesses together to try you. That

is considered a fair reason to reduce a guideline.

So we go from 34 to 32.

And then under Chapter 5 the government made this motion for a four-level reduction, which she has -- Ms. Bolstad has fully supported. I agree with her characterization that your participation at trial was at every level to be credited as truthful, consistent. Brave and straightforward were her words. I agree with those characterizations.

And that, then, took us to level 28. We're at Criminal History Category II, because you do have your own story. It's not a single story. It has its own dimensions. And criminal histories count, so you ended up at a guideline range of 87 to 108 months.

Now, before all those adjustments, were variances for your early acceptance, for Chapter 5, the range, as I calculated it, it was 168 months to 210 months before those adjustments.

And now the government is recommending a five-year sentence, and Mr. Barnett has said he's imploring me to follow that recommendation and yet made the point, too, that he can't really argue for less but I should consider less.

The truth is you've done everything you can do. You've done everything you can do, given what you did do and given what its profound cause was, and there really isn't anything more anyone else can say about that other than you have to go to prison. You have to serve a sentence. And if what you've

demonstrated to now is any sign of what you're able to do while you're in prison, you're going to be a credit to the community when you come out.

I believe you're going to help other people who are plagued by the very addiction that got you so twisted and away from your talents and potential. But the good news in that story is that you have a life to reclaim and you have the talent and intellect and it looks like really unstoppable motivation, as long as you stay clean, to go forward.

Given the -- this very serious crime, however, I do not believe it's reasonable to sentence you below 60 months. I just -- for you personally, I wish I could write a -- another end to your single story that would allow you to walk out of jail and just pretend it didn't happen and move on, but that can't happen.

I want you to be proud of what you've accomplished since that day the police came to your apartment.

You know, Ms. Bolstad is focusing on your -- your early cooperation and Mr. Barnett emphasized that even at your arraignment you were ready to talk, but I remember the testimony of the officers being in your living room and making a proposal to you. Of course it had a benefit. Cooperate and you can avoid a very serious mandatory penalty, or not, and, I don't know, we saw how some people reacted when that premise was presented to them in your case, and we saw how others

reacted, but it seems to me you never hesitated, from the beginning, even though you were facing extraordinary risks to your own liberty and your own future. That's, I think, evidence of your fundamental characteristic.

So when I'm told I need to evaluate those personal characteristics, you, Ms. Godvin, are, at your core, a good person who got very twisted up in this hideous habit that indeed could have ruined your life, did cause the death of your friend, has caused the deaths of many others, is still ruining the lives of so many others, but there's real hope for you.

So if you were carrying a secret hope that maybe it would be better than 60 months, I'm just -- I don't think that is reasonable. So I'm setting that unrealistic hope over there.

But look at it this way: 60 months is a lot less than 168 months and definitely less than ten years.

I don't think you even need that college degree. You know you have a future and you know you can make great strides while you're in prison, so I don't feel the need to try to encourage your knowledge to do that. I know you're already launched in that way.

I hope you will help Mr. Barnett as he works with Ms. Bolstad to write that letter I was referring to because you're the source of specific information. And what the sheriff does with it is his concern, but I think there ought to be a formal presentation to him in a letter that lays out these

concerns. Not just the shocking information you testify to about open drug use within the correctional facilities and in inpatient treatment program, but what is so unfortunate is that while you were working on a program and trying to advance yourself, what you needed for that, your books, your notes and all of that, were lost or taken from you or whatever happened there. That needs to be noted so that something can be done in the future for the next Morgan Godvin who comes along with that level of motivation, so that that particular frustration is not there.

In addition to the prison sentence, you have to pay a \$100 statutory assessment. That's required by law. The sooner you get it paid, the sooner the Bureau of Prisons will stop taking, fractionally, money off your books every month; the money that would otherwise be available for toothpaste or whatever.

There's not any restitution obligation being sought here, so none is imposed. It's not reasonable in this context for me to impose a fine because, first of all, you don't have the means to pay it, but, secondly, I don't think it's warranted, so I'm not imposing any fine.

I'm imposing a period of supervised release of three years following your release from prison.

Now, it's a condition of supervised release that you obey all laws, that you report truthfully and regularly to your probation officer. You were on release pretrial for a period

of time. It's a similar kind of set of standard conditions that you'll have to follow.

In addition to those, you'll have to provide a DNA sample if your probation officer requests it.

On your release, I want you to have an updated mental health and substance abuse evaluation because what I want to know when you come out is what you need.

If you're no longer at risk for relapse and those kinds of behaviors, then this recommendation of an inpatient treatment program might not be timely. On the other hand, if a professional says that would be of use, then you're going to be required to comply with your probation officer's directions for a treatment program for your mental health, for substance abuse, and if you're -- if the professionals say an inpatient program for up to 120 days be warranted and that is what your PO says to do, that's what you need to do.

The point of having the evaluation, though, is to see where you really are, because we don't know. You'll have that prison experience behind you.

While you're in prison, you'll have access to a number of counseling opportunities. Take advantage of the resources there. Find out from the counselors what programs are within the circle of your potential interests and skills for which you qualify. Plus, you can make good use of those days or not. You can be a good example to others who are not. You can get

caught up in the -- the negative part of that culture or not, and you can come out much stronger than you even are today. I really hope that's the case.

We have presently in the Court a reentry court program. What it is involves sustained support on a multidisciplinary level with a judge, a prosecutor, a defender, treatment professionals, and the like, working with a group of individuals who are on supervision, who help them stay clean and to address whatever needs they have. The people that are in that program, when they succeed, graduate. They get to knock a year off the supervision end.

You may or may not be interested in that. You may or may not be a candidate for that. I don't get to say whether someone goes in or not. That's a matter for the team to accept. But you are going to be required to observe a session of the reentry court assuming -- and I certainly hope that's the case -- that it's still in effect.

I recommend that the Bureau of Prisons designate you first to the lowest security setting for which you qualify because I think your good behavior while you've been in custody -- although, you had a violation that brought you back to custody -- has been remarkable and you should be given all the privileges for which you qualify.

I recommend they designate you to a facility as close to the District of Oregon as reasonable.

1 That said, however, there's not a women's facility here, and I can't change that. 2 If it's not clear, then I've accepted the quidelines 3 analysis set out by the PSR writer and by counsel. I've also 4 granted the government's motion as reflected in the conclusion 5 that I drew the four-level reduction should be allowed. 6 7 Now, from 87, at a low end of 28, Category II, to get to 60, I need to vary further to a level 24. So that's to get to 8 the low-end range of 60, which is within the 57- to 71-month 9 range at Criminal History Category II. Check my math. 10 Ms. Bolstad has been known to correct my addition and 11 subtraction, so I want to be sure. 12 13 MS. BOLSTAD: I think you're right, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else, 14 Ms. Bolstad? 15 MS. BOLSTAD: Yes, Your Honor. I made a mistake in 16 17 my sentencing memorandum in recommending three years of 18 supervised release. 19 THE COURT: Oh, okay. 20 MS. BOLSTAD: The plea is correct and the PSR is correct that it's actually a minimum four-year term of 21 22 supervised release. 23 THE COURT: So it will be four. MS. BOLSTAD: And then the government also moves to 24 25 dismiss Counts 1, 4, and 5 as to this defendant.

1 THE COURT: And they're dismissed. Now, Ms. Godvin, as part of your plea agreement with the 2 prosecutors, you gave up your right to appeal to a higher court 3 the fact that I allowed you to plead guilty and any appeal of 4 the sentence I just imposed as long as I did not sentence you 5 higher than the correctly calculated guideline range before any 6 7 adjustments, which I clearly did not. So if you think you have a right to appeal, you only have 8 14 days to file a notice of appeal. 9 If you did, you can bet Ms. Bolstad will be right there 10 telling me, "We have a deal. She gave it up." I'm still 11 required to tell you that. Do you understand? 12 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Barnett, do you have anything else? 14 MR. BARNETT: Other than thanks to Ms. Bolstad for 15 16 catching that. I was not paying attention to when the Court said three years of the supervised release. Thank you. 17 18 THE COURT: Thank you for raising that. All right. Good luck. 19 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Take care of yourself. 21 22 We're in recess on this matter. 23 (Hearing concluded.) 24

25

CERTIFICATE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. MORGAN ELIZABETH GODVIN 3:14-cr-00267-BR SENTENCING December 21, 2015 I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the record, taken by stenographic means, of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause. A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature, or digitally signed signature is not certified. /s/Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter Signature Date: 6/16/16 CSR Expiration Date: 3/31/17 Oregon CSR No. 98-0346